

Hon. William Downing

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
IN AND FOR KING COUNTY11 WILLIAM DUSSAULT as Guardian Ad
12 Litem for S.P., a minor, EUGENE G.
13 PATNODE and CLARISSA A. PATNODE,
14 husband and wife,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND REGIONAL
18 MEDICAL CENTER, a non-profit
19 organization, licensed in Washington state;
20 SELLEN CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., a
21 Washington corporation,

22 Defendant.

23 No. 05-2-36911-6 SEA

24 DEFENDANT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
25 AND REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER'S
26 INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO
27 CLARISSA A. PATNODE28 AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS
29 THERETO30 INTERROGATORY NO. 25: Describe in detail the facts upon which you rely to claim
31 that the defendants were negligent, identifying each act or omission which you believe was
32 wrongful and indicating what you believe should have been done under the circumstances that
33 then existed.

34 ANSWER:

35 The defendant should have provided a properly pressured health care facility, including
36 Operating Room #15 ("OR #15"), in accordance with the Washington Administrative Code
3738 CHRMG INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
39 AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 140 LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC
41 116 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 1200
42 Seattle, WA 98101
43 (206) 340-1214 fax (206) 222-1750

1 when Plaintiff S.P. went in for her medical procedure. The defendant should have also provided
2 a safe and clean health care facility, particularly OR #15, free of aspergillus spores in accordance
3 with Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center ("CHRM C") Infection Control Policies
4 and Procedures Manual (2001) (hereinafter "CHRM C Manual"). Specifically, CHRM C's
5 Manual provides the following:

6

- 7 • in the HEPA filtered environment of the SCCA unit and in the Operating Room and
8 Surgical Suite, it is expected that no Aspergillus spores will be collected.
- 9 • in other areas of the hospital, results will be compared with outside air aspergillus spore
10 levels and will be expected to fall below that of the outside air during the same sample
collection.

11

12 CHRM C/PATNODE00059. Unlike CHRM C's Manual indicating HEPA filters are utilized or to
13 be employed in the Operating Room and Surgical Suite, CHRM C does not use HEPA filtration.
14 See Answers to Interrogatory No. 32 and 35. Specifically, CHRM C's filters consist of 2 banks
15 of filters and they typically are 2 inches thick with an efficiency rating of 30% and are backed up
16 by a 95% high efficiency filter. *Id.* A HEPA or absolute filtration system has an efficiency
17 rating greater or equal to 99.97% of particulates greater or equal to 0.3 microns in diameter and
18 therefore filters aspergillus spores. Subsequently, CHRM C's filtration system does not filter
19 aspergillus spores.
20

21

22 Joan Heath, Kathy Goodrich, Danielle Zerr, Steve Scheibe, Ruth Benefield, Treurnau
23 Katz, and Richard Molteni were negligent in allowing the CHRM C Manual to set forth
24 inaccurate information particularly in light of the fact CHRM C's physicians and treating medical
25 professionals relied on this information in providing medical care. CHRM C negligently adopted
26 this Manual. Plaintiffs have attempted to schedule the depositions of Steve Scheibe, Ruth
27 Benefield, Kathy Goodrich, and Richard Molteni, but CHRM C has not provided Plaintiffs with
28 dates for these depositions. Plaintiffs anticipate that additional information as to CHRM C's
29 negligence will be discovered during these depositions along with the discovery that CHRM C
30 should be producing on May 4, 2007.

31

32

33

34

CHRM C INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 2

LAWMAN, LAWMAN & ROBBISON, PLLP
316 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 467-1214 Fax (206) 252-1790

1 CHRMC's Manual cites important medical treatises to support the adoption of measures
2 to protect the facility's environment, but many of CHRMC infection control practitioners did not
3 read these materials. Had the CHRMC infection control practitioners taken the time to read
4 these materials, they should have understood the difference between a HEPA filtration system
5 and a high efficiency filtration system. If CHRMC's infection control professionals would have
6 understood the type of filtration system in the Operating Rooms and Surgical Suite, it would
7 have been evident and appropriate safety measures would have been put in place to ensure a
8 patient's safety during a surgical procedure. As this did not occur, S.P. was not in a safe and
9 clean environment during her surgical procedure and CHRMC infection control and engineering
10 professionals breached this standard of care.

1 Further, evidence of CHRMC's negligence was its failure to act on information obtained
2 through air sample testing, which revealed higher counts of aspergillus spores inside the facility
3 than outside. As noted earlier, there should be lower levels of aspergillus spores outside the
4 hospital than inside it. Prior to S.P.'s infection other patients acquired nosocomial aspergillus
5 infections. CHRMC knew, or should have known, that it had a serious infection control problem
6 within the hospital that placed patients in danger of being exposed to aspergillus spores. Despite
7 these red flags, CHRMC infection control practitioners and the entire ICCC failed to adequately
8 investigate and determine the source(s) of the aspergillus spores and infections. CHRMC's
9 negligence was compounded by the utter failure of the infection control professionals to take
10 "routine" air samples in the OR in accordance with CHRMC's Manual during the time period
11 preceding S.P.'s infection. See CHRMC/PATNODE00058. Plaintiffs have obtained evidence
12 from Neudorfer Engineers, CDJ Engineers, Inc., and Sellen indicating critical care areas within
13 CHRMC were negatively pressured prior to and after S.P. acquired the aspergillus infection.

1 CHRMC's infection control practitioners were also negligent in their failure to provide
2 "safety education" for construction managers/workers in addition to technical and professional
3 staff before or during projects in accordance with CHRMC's Manual. *Id.* CHRMC did not

1 adequately determine safe routes for construction workers to follow within the facility and/or
2 enforce worker restrictions into prohibited areas such as the hospital cafeteria.
3

4 Other violations of CHRMC's Manual include but are not limited to the failure of
5 Danielle Zerr, M.D., Chair of the ICCC, to make unscheduled inspections of construction sites.
6 *Id.* In contravention of the Manual, Dr. Zerr had little to no oversight with the construction
7 occurring at CHRMC. Although Joan Heath, as the Infection Control Manager, may have
8 occasionally made unscheduled visits, construction enforcement and compliance with the
9 CHRMC Manual was mainly left to Julie Smith. Ms. Smith lacked the experience, training and
10 education to oversee this construction, particularly in light of the size and magnitude of the
11 projects and the potential danger posed to patients in critical care areas. CHRMC elected not to
12 employ an outside third-party with the expertise, knowledge and training to reasonably oversee
13 the construction when it was presented with such an opportunity. CHRMC assumed all
14 responsibility and risk when it made this decision.
15

16 Upon information and belief, CHRMC neither obtained a commissioning prior to
17 beginning renovations, nor after renovations were completed in numerous areas of the hospital.
18 In 1999 there appears to have been some commissioning completed in a very few areas, but it
19 was not until approximately December of 2003 that CHRMC obtained a commissioning within
20 the hospital for areas under construction such as the A and B Wings. This only occurred because
21 it was determined that the hospital was negatively pressured. Phase III of the OR/PACU
22 renovations started in approximately October of 2001 and were not completed until
23 approximately May of 2002. Despite the impact of these renovations on CHRMC critical care
24 systems, CHRMC did not obtain a commissioning. Thus, CHRMC did not know whether the
25 HVAC system in the OR/PACU was operating as it was designed. If CHRMC would have
26 completed a commissioning, as it should have, it would have discovered there was a problem
27 with the HVAC systems in the OR and PACU. CHRMC infection control practitioners
28 undertook the duty of infection control during construction. See CHRMC/PATNODE00079-
29
30
31
32
33
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 4

LYNNAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC
317 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 467-1314 fax (206) 292-1770

1 00084. As stated in CHRMC Manual, infection control should be "involved in planning for all
2 phases of maintenance, construction and/or renovation projects, including the design phase...."
3 *Id.* As CHRMC failed to request a commissioning in this area, it violated the Guidelines for
4 Design and Construction of Hospital and Health Care Facilities. See AIA Guidelines for Design
5 and Construction of Hospital and Health Care Facilities § 5.3 (2001). This is further evidence of
6 CHRMC's negligence.
7

8 CHRMC's Manual expressly and unequivocally provides that "[t]he most common
9 source of filamentous fungal infections in hospitals is thought to be through dissemination of
10 fungal spores by ventilation systems." CHRMC/Patnode00057. CHRMC's Manual warns that
11 the most immediate danger posed to patients during construction is a compromised HVAC
12 system. However, CHRMC did nothing to protect the HVAC systems from increased exposure
13 to dirt and airborne pathogens such as aspergillus during outside construction.
14

15 The lack of communication, education and training by CHRMC's infection control
16 practitioners and the ICCC to the Building and Engineering Department, and other staff was
17 negligent. See e.g., CHRMC/PATNODE00043. For example, CHRMC's B&E should have
18 received information about the "Hospital infection control program" from CHRMC's Manual
19 plus annual education and training on infection control activities. The deposition testimony and
20 interviews of fact witnesses clearly indicates this training was not done. Also, CHRMC's
21 infection control practitioners did not make this Manual available to all hospital and contracted
22 employees. CHRMC's Manual also states that "The Infection Control staff is responsible for
23 developing the curriculum for nursing orientation and continuing education relating to
24 surveillance, prevention, and control of infections." CHRMC/PATNODE00049. This also
25 does not appear to have been done. Among CHRMC's employees there is a large minority
26 population where English is a second language. CHRMC's infection control staff failed to verify
27 whether all such employees understood the proper safety measures that they were being asked to
28 complete as stated in the Manual. In general, CHRMC's B&E Departmental employees lacked
29
30

31 32 33 34
CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 5

LATMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC
216 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 310
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 340-1314 fax (206) 343-1790

1 the knowledge, education and to even be aware that the HVAC system was a common source of
2 aspergillus infections in hospitals.

3 Moreover, had the CHRMC infection control practitioners fully understood the danger
4 posed to patients by a malfunctioning HVAC system, experts in the HVAC profession could
5 have been employed to investigate and effectively mitigate the problem and properly train the
6 Building and Engineering ("B&E") Department. CHRMC should have had manufacturer's
7 representatives for its facility systems provide training to the B&E Department and record those
8 training sessions for future use. CHRMC's B&E Department does not even have Owner's
9 Manuals to consult so it can properly maintain its HVAC systems. Providing the B&E
10 Department with proper materials and training would have ensured that the B&E Department
11 knew how the systems were designed to work. It would have also ensured that these systems
12 were properly maintained. This was not done.

13 Rather, CHRMC allowed Leonard Blumer, who is under-qualified, to have full control
14 and responsibility for operating and maintaining these HVAC systems. CHRMC's infection
15 control staff and the ICCC failed to verify whether he had the knowledge, skill and education to
16 complete this task or that documentation was available to verify function of the HVAC systems.
17 In fact, CHRMC's infection control provided no oversight for any services that Mr. Blumer
18 rendered on the HVAC systems. Not only did Mr. Blumer fail to correct serious HVAC
19 malfunctions with the sheaves, bearings, belts and damper actuators, it allowed Mr. Blumer to
20 alter the air filters CHRMC purchased. Specifically, Mr. Blumer removed the gasketing on the
21 air filters and replaced it with his "own method" of gasketing, which left an unsealed gap. This
22 clearly compromised CHRMC's HVAC systems and created unnecessary and unreasonable
23 hazards for patients receiving care within the hospital.

24 Knowing that CHRMC's B&E employees had not been properly trained in the area of
25 infection control and in accordance with the Manual, CHRMC's infection control practitioners
26 and the ICCC negligently relied on the B&E Department to ensure that the HVAC system
27

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 6

LAWMAN, LAWMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC
336 Coaltrain Ave. S., Suite 510
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 340-1214 Fax: (206) 282-1190

1 complied with, *inter alia*, the Washington Administrative Code. Moreover, CHRMC negligently
2 relied on the B&E Department to determine that the HVAC systems functioned as it was
3 designed. The B&E Department neither determined that the HVAC system met infection control
4 standards nor that they functioned as they were designed. The evidence indicates no one at
5 CHRMC assumed these duties. CHRMC's maintenance and care of its HVAC systems is
6 completely reprehensible and patients such as S.P. were left to suffer the brunt of their
7 negligence.

8 Plaintiffs also have evidence that CHRMC's B&E employees failed to maintain proper
9 barrier protections when entering the ceiling. Had CHRMC's infection control practitioners
10 engaged in proper education, training, enforcement and surveillance in accordance with the
11 CHRMC Manual, these infection control problems would not have existed in this facility on a
12 consistent basis.

13 Upon information and belief, CHRMC's infection control practitioners violated
14 Washington's reportable diseases regulations and its own Manual by failing to report a potential
15 outbreak of aspergillus infections. See CHRMC/PATNODE00140-00144. Similarly, CHRMC's
16 surveillance and investigation of aspergillus infections within the facility was below the standard
17 of care. If CHRMC would have used reasonable efforts to conduct such activities problems with
18 the HVAC systems, among other infection control problems, would have been discovered.

19 Plaintiffs have given CHRMC an extension on discovery that has been served on them
20 and this response will be supplemented within a reasonable time when such discovery is
21 received, and when CHRMC allows Plaintiffs to inspect CHRMC premises as set forth in
22 Request for Inspection No. 1. Further, this answer will be supplemented when CHRMC allows
23 Plaintiffs to take the depositions of CHRMC employees that it has requested and when Plaintiffs
24 receive documents in accordance with pending *subpoena duces tecum*. This answer will also be
25 supplemented with expert reports pursuant to the case scheduling order.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 7

LAWSON, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP
216 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 240-1314 fax (206) 292-1790

1
2 **INTERROGATORY NO. 36:** Identify all fact witnesses and expert witnesses who will
3 testify about the basis listed in interrogatory no. 35.
4

5 **ANSWER:** Plaintiffs Gene and Clarissa Patnode and Plaintiff S.P. treating physicians at
6 CHRMC. See their deposition transcripts. Plaintiffs' experts will be disclosed in accordance
7 with the case schedule order.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES AND RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR**
16 **PRODUCTION SUBMITTED this 27th day of April, 2007.**
17
18
19

20 LAYMAN, LAYMAN, & ROBINSON, PLLP
21
22
23 By 
24 John R. Layman, WSBA No. 13823
25 Andrew A. Schillinger, WSBA No. 34189
26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 11

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP
316 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 343-1714 fax (206) 292-1700

CHILDREN'S INFECTION CONTROL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

AIR SAMPLING

- results are communicated to stakeholders, including but not limited to Facilities management, contractors, unit managers, and hospital administration

MANAGEMENT OF AIR SAMPLING RESULTS

Standards established at Children's Hospital for acceptable sample results from ambient air are as follows:

- in the HEPA filtered environment of the SCCA unit and in the Operating Room and Surgical Suite, it is expected that no *Aspergillus* spores will be collected
- in other areas of the hospital, results will be compared with outside air *Aspergillus* spore levels and will be expected to fall below that of the outside air during the same sample collection

CONCERNING LEVELS

Depending on the location in the hospital where concerning levels are identified, infection control practitioners may:

- inspect the area where a concerning sample was obtained for issues such as:
 - air pressure gradient disturbances
 - disruption of construction barriers
 - leaking window or door seals
 - stained or water damaged ceiling tiles, flooring, or structural material
 - obvious mold or mildew growth
 - a need for environmental cleaning
- close an area to occupancy/use or delay opening an area after construction/renovation
- contact the Facilities manager, Building and Engineering director and/or construction contractor for remediation of construction barriers and air pressure gradients
- work with the unit or clinic nurse managers determine occupancy and use of a specific area while remediation occurs
- arrange for Environmental Services staff to provide thorough cleaning of a specific area
- re-sample the area after remediation activities have been completed before opening to unrestricted occupancy/use



ROG 4, 8, 10, 12 - 000022